Name of Applicant: MSD of Pike Township
Overall Ranking: 93.8 out of 100

I. PROJECT ABSTRACT (Up to 5 POINTS)

0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points
Abstract not provided or does not address any required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel)	Only includes 1-2 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel)	Includes 3-4 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel). Points reduced if exceeds two pages.	Includes all 5 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel). Points reduced if exceeds two pages.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.3**

Comments:
The 2-paged Abstract addressed the five required components but points were deducted since the applicant did not describe how this existing program would be expanded through new grant funding.

II. COMPETITIVE PRIORITY POINTS (Up to 10 POINTS)

A. Required Descriptions (Up to 2 Points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Descriptions not provided	Just one of the two required descriptions provided (how application priority is met, OR origin of partnership)	Both descriptions provided (how priority is met, <u>and</u> origin of partnership)

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments:

B. Organizational Priority Points (Up to 4 Points)

0 points	4 points
Does not meet criteria	Applicant meets criteria

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4**

Comments:

C. Programming Priority Points (Up to 4 Points)

0 points	4 points
Does not meet criteria	Meets criteria & area listed in Section V Goals & Objectives

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4**

Comments:

Section II Total (averaged) Points out of 10 Possible: 10

III. NEED FOR PROJECT (Up to 5 POINTS)

A. Data Evidence Demonstrating Need (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
Data evidence not presented	Data not provided for all three areas (i.e., achievement, demographics and behavioral)	All three areas addressed (i.e., achievement, demographics & behavioral) and presented for EACH school to be served	Achievement, demographic & behavioral data shown for EACH school (Attachment B) <u>and</u> demonstrates high need -- in both poverty levels and academic achievement.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.3**

Comments:
Attachment B is incomplete. *Numbers of students* to be served (*by school*) missing, although the proposal notes that 225 students will be served across all three schools (see Abstract, p 37). Achievement, demographic & behavioral needs have been identified within Section III (for each school). High need is demonstrated in poverty and academic achievement levels.

B. Demonstrate Expanded Out-of-School Time Programming (Up to 1 Point)

0 points: Chart/graphic not provided	**1 point:** Chart/graphic provided showing increased time that addresses gaps for each school

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

C. Describe Process for Assessing Needs/Services (Up to 1 Point)

0 points: Process and/or partner involvement not described	**1 point:** Process and partners involved are clearly described

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

Section III Total (averaged) Points out of 5 Possible: 4.3

IV. PARTNERSHIPS/COLLABORATIONS   (Up to 5 POINTS)

A. Describe Collaboration with Other Agencies/Funding Streams (Up to 1 point)

0 points: Not addressed or too vague to award point	**1 point:** Applicant demonstrates collaboration with other agencies, e.g., Title I, Child Nutrition, TANF, State/local programs

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

B. Describe How Each Partner's Contribution Supports Program (Up to 1 point)

0 points: Attachment F not submitted	**1 point:** Applicant completed and submitted Attachment F

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

C. Memorandum of Understanding for Applicant & Key Partners (Up to 3 Points)

0 points MOU/s detailing partner roles & responsibilities not provided. *NOTE: This is in addition to Attachment F.*	**1 point** At least one MOU provided in Appendix, but does not fully articulate roles & responsibilities between applicant & partner	**2 points** MOU/s provided in Appendix for all key partners offering *basic info* relevant to applicant/partner roles	**3 points** MOU/s provided in Appendix for all key partners providing clearly-articulated expectations for applicant and for partner

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments:
Although *Attachment F* and the MOUs found in the Appendices (starting on p 75) are nearly identical, some discrepancies occur (that also may impact budget):
- MOU for Codelicious shows cost of $9K (see p 84). Budget (Contractual) shows $7,500
- Attachment F includes "Storyworks – Scholastic subscriptions" at $2K. This is not reflected in Budget.
- MOU for Snapology (anti-bulling) shows cost of $2,250 (see p 81). Not included in Budget
- MOU for Youth Philanthropy shows cost of $500. Not in Budget.
- No MOU for "Camp Invention," STEM summer camp curriculum. Shown in Budget for $4K.
- No MOU for Bricks 4 Kids. Shown in Budget (Contractual) for $4K.

Section IV Total (averaged) Points out of 5 Possible: 5

V. PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION (Up to 30 points)

A. Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities and Assessments (Up to 8 points)

0-2 point range	3-6 point range	7-8 point range
Table overviewing Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities & Assessments includes *less than* <u>all three</u> of the <u>required goals</u>, i.e., (1) student achievement, (2) behavioral, & (3) family involvement	Includes all three required goals, i.e., achievement, behavioral and family involvement -- as well as HS, pre-K, or summer goals, *if applicable*. At least <u>two objectives</u> provided <u>per goal</u>. Activities are aligned with each objective; performance measures include numerical targets and are each connected to a specific measurement strategy	*Includes all three required goals, i.e., achievement, behavioral and family involvement -- as well as HS, pre-K, or summer goals, if applicable.* *At least two objectives provided per goal.* **Highly engaging** *activities are aligned with objectives;* ***challenging performance measures*** *include numerical targets and are each connected to* a specific measurement strategy

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **7**

Comments:
Summer program goals/objectives *embedded into before/after school program* goals/objectives.
◻ Within ILEARN/NWEA "Academic measures," targets are based on spring data results (not a spring-fall improvement factor, as anticipated for *summer* goals).
◻ Goal #2 (**STEM** & Literacy) focuses on increased interest (survey) in STEM clubs, activities & courses; enrollment in summer STEM camp; attendance. Family goal is that 70% of regular participant's families will attend at least one event related to Literacy and STEM development (program records).

B. Evidence of Previous Success (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Information not provided in **APPENDIX**.	If **previous grantee**: Some description of previous attendance rates and program benefits. If **new grantee**: Limited information on supporting student retention; and general strategies for providing academic assistance.	If **previous grantee**: Clearly documented quantitative evidence of past 30+ and 60+ attendance rates and academic outcomes (e.g., ISTEP+, DIBELS, NWEA) showing increased performance. If **new grantee**: Specific activities provided to support student recruitment and attendance and to provide academic assistance.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.6**

Comments:
p. 102 Appendices
Goal was to serve 200 students at least 60 days or more (Cohort 7 which includes Central & Eastbrook Elementary Schools …now included in Cohort 9 proposal).
◻ Year 1 (2014-15) served 145; Year 2 served 178; Year 3 served 171; Year 4 (2017-18) served 157.
◻ Did not meet goal. Participation dropped in each of the last two years. (Note that although applicant's narrative states they met their participation goal, the Chart for Cohort 7 on p 103 does not reflect that.)

"Evidence of Success" in appendix does not show achievement data (ISTEP) … only NWEA/Acuity.
◻ ISTEP data are shown in proposal on pages 42-43 for previously served Central and Eastbrook Elementary Schools.
◻ Central Elementary declined in *Overall* achievement (ELA pass rate of 45% in 2015 to 41% in 2017; Math pass rate of 45% in 2015 dropped to 31% by 2017).
◻ Eastbrook declined in *Overall* achievement (ELA pass rate 63% in 2015 to 54% in 2017; Math pass rate 51% in 2015 to 46% in 2017).

C. Design Requirements (Up to 20 total points for Items 1-8)

C-1. Requirements of GEPA 427 (Up to 1 point)

0 points	1 point
Information not provided in the APPENDIX or within proposal narrative.	Specific equitability issue identified and addressed (either in Appendix or proposal narrative) to reduce program barrier

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

C-2.   Targeted Students and Their Families (Up to 3 points)

1 point	2 point	3 points
Only partial information provided (i.e., only Attachment B *List of Schools* submitted; OR only narrative supporting criteria & process to recruit students provided). If *List of Schools* (Attachment B) not submitted, zero points.	Identifies Title 1 and non-Title 1 schools (Attachment B); and describes (in narrative) general strategies for recruiting students. Justifies inclusion of any schools with less than 40% poverty (*if applicable*).	Submits Attachment B (identifying schools). Narrative describes specific strategies for recruiting students; and justifies inclusion of schools with less than 40% poverty (*if applicable*). Majority of served schools demonstrate HIGH NEED (e.g., D/F schools; poverty rates greater than 50%)

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments:

C-3.   Dissemination of Information (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Information not provided	Outlines general steps the applicant will take to disseminate general program information.	Provides specific steps to disseminate detailed program information including: service description, program location, and how to access the program.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments:

C-4.   Communication with Schools (Up to 3 Points)

1 point	2 points	3 points
Less than all four topics are addressed (nonpublic students; accessing academic records; sharing student progress; and alignment of in-school and out-of-school-time efforts). Zero points if none of 4 topics.	*All four topics* are addressed (nonpublic students; accessing academic records; sharing student progress; and alignment of in-school and out-of-school-time efforts)	*All four* topics addressed; and applicant demonstrates its strong understanding and commitment to appropriately obtain & use student data to inform efforts (e.g., specifies strategies for sharing information with teachers & parents; detailed MOU included in Appendix -- if applicant is not an LEA).

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.6**

Comments:
Applicant addresses all four topics. Strategies for sharing student progress are provided, but lacked specificity as to how these data will inform efforts.

C-5. Parental Involvement, Family Literacy, and Related Family Educational Attainment (Up to 3 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
Information not provided	Plan describes at least one, solid activity to engage parents in the program.	Evaluation of community needs/resources conducted; and multiple activities planned to engage parents	Evaluation of needs/resources conducted; and multiple activities specified to engage parents; and needs of working parents considered.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.6**

Comments:
While *many* resources are available to parents, the proposal Timeline shows only two Family Events scheduled (November and April). There appears to be potential for engaging parents in STEM, cultural arts and health & wellness activities, although it is not clear to the reviewer if these are routine events/opportunities (at least monthly) that will attract and engage families. At-home access to online curriculum (Codelicious, myON, Go Math!, MobyMax) may be readily available to families, but without instructional training/support for accessing/using these technologies, parent participation may be very limited. Applicant did not address such PD support for families.

C-6. USDA Approved Snacks/Meals for 21st CCLC Participants (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Information not provided – or Applicant does not offer (optional) snacks/meals to program participants	Only one of two required elements provided (i.e., how snacks/meals will be acquired & distributed to sites; OR specification that snacks/meals meet USDA and IDOE guidelines	Both required elements included: how snacks/meals will be acquired & distributed; and that snacks/meals meet USDA and IDOE guidelines

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments:

C-7. Weekly Schedule (Up to 5 points)

0 points	1-3 point range	4-5 point range
Information not provided	General weekly schedule provided that meets minimum hours of operation requirements for grade levels served. Applicant intends to also operate during summer OR extended-breaks, but did not submit separate weekly schedule.	Detailed weekly schedule provided for EACH site that meets minimum hours of operation requirements; Elem & MS schedules reflect diverse and engaging activities (academic, behavioral, enrichment/recreational); Separate schedules are provided for summer and extended breaks (if applicable).

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.6**

Comments:
Four days per week for 30 weeks (2.5 hours after-school and 30 minutes before school where teacher tutors are "available"), which allows applicant to meet the minimum number of 12 hours per week. *Very little* information provided throughout this proposal to support the *before school* component, e.g., numbers of participants; strategies for supporting students (other than "tutors").

STEM has been designated as the **programming priority**, but STEM enrichment is **two days per week**, one hour each, for a total of two hours per week. STEM events occur in the "evenings" …via the CLEAR Computer Lab (? for 2 hrs/day Monday-Friday. Is the lab "available for use" or is specific support routinely provided?). It should, however, also be noted that the 3-week, six-hours-daily, summer camp will be focused entirely on STEM.

C-8. 21st CCLC Learning Center Messaging (Up to 1 point)

0 points	1 point
No description for meeting the requirement	Applicant describes how it will meet the requirement

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

Section V Total (averaged) Points out of 30 Possible: 27.4

VI. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Up to 5 POINTS)

0 points	1-2 points range	3-4 point range	5 points
Information not provided	Includes one-dimensional description and plan for providing PD (e.g., focus is solely on staff attendance at State and national meetings or conferences – but no PD plan is articulated to support specific needs of center's staff, aligned to its program goals & objectives)	Includes detailed plan for providing PD; connects PD to program quality and goals of project; PD strategies center around State/national workshops and trainings, but also include anticipated trainings (e.g., First Aid, vendor-provided trainings to support staff use of software instructional programs). May include a detailed chart of planned PD activities.	Needs of program staff assessed and PD is a tiered-approach, addressing needs of specific staff roles (i.e., leadership vs. instructional needs). Multiple approaches will support needs (State & national workshops/conferences; and ongoing trainings to support locally-identified needs). Plan addresses initial kick-off, turn-over and ongoing training for new and veteran staff; connects PD to program quality and goals of the project; includes detailed chart of planned PD activities.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5**

Comments:

VII. EVALUATION	**(Up to 15 POINTS)**

A. Identification of Local Evaluator (Up to 3 points)

1 point Applicant intends to hire local evaluator, but entity not yet selected	**2 points** Local evaluator identified (external to the program) with evaluation experience	**3 points** Selected local evaluator with demonstrated expertise in data analyses, report writing, and afterschool program knowledge

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments:

B. Evaluation Design (Up to 10 points)

0-2 point range Plan is not provided -- or of insufficient detail to convey understanding of local evaluation expectations	**3-5 point range** Some key elements are included in local evaluation design plan, but several descriptions are missing or vaguely presented	**6-8 point range** Plan demonstrates understanding of expectations – with some key elements better articulated than others. Applicant must address all Section V performance measures & assessments to score in this range (or higher).	**9-10 point range** Plan clearly articulated. Includes evaluator's roles; addresses collection/analyses of all Section V performance measures & assessments; details eval implementation timeframes; and specifies how findings are shared and used to improve program

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **9.6**

Comments:
How the evaluation findings will be used to improve the program was not as clearly evidenced as the other required elements of this section.

C. Annual Reporting (Up to 2 points)

0 points Information not provided. Applicant does not address its obligation to submit reports/data for both State and federal reporting	**1 point** Applicant adequately addresses at least one key annual reporting obligation, e.g., local program evaluator's report submitted to IDOE at end of each program year (showing program quality evidence, attendance trends and progress toward performance measures)	**2 points** Applicant understands its obligation to submit reports/data to the IDOE (i.e., annual local program evaluator's report with program quality evidence, attendance trends and progress toward performance measures; and data required in EZ reports). Grantee also uses IN-QPSA online self-assessment, to locally rate its performance.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments:

Section VII Total (averaged) Points out of 15 Possible: 14.6

VIII. SUPPORT FOR STRATEGIC PRIORITIES	**(Up to 5 POINTS)**

0 points Information not provided	**1-2 points** Applicant affirms that its program will align with Indiana Academic Standards but does not adequately convey how that will occur	**3-4 points** Applicant provides concrete examples of how its program will align to Indiana Academic Standards (e.g., collaborative planning between regular classroom teachers and extended-learning-time staff; evidenced-based software used for literacy support)	**5 points** Strong evidence (multiple strategies) provided supporting extended-learning-time program's alignment with Indiana Academic Standards via routine coordination of planning, PD and academic efforts between program and school/district staff where students attend

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.6**

Comments:

IX. SUSTAINABILITY PLAN	**(Up to 5 POINTS)**

0 points	1 point	3 points	5 points
Information not provided	Outlines existing partnerships and a general plan for sustaining program levels beyond the grant.	Outlines existing partnerships and potential partnerships; and identifies potential future funding sources (e.g., general funds/Title I)	Outlines existing partnerships, expanding partnerships & potential partnerships; provides a well-conceived plan for sustaining program levels through increased local capacity and/or future funding sources. Establishes sustainability goal for Year One programming.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.6**

Comments:
Applicant met expectations, but did not establish a sustainability goal for Year One (applicant's Year 2).

X. SAFETY AND TRANSPORTATION (Up to 5 POINTS)

0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points
Information not provided	Provides some general staffing requirements (e.g., criminal background checks) and commits to providing students' transportation home after program	Demonstrates detailed program safety plan (background checks on file/confidential); district/agency staffing requirements met; required parent sign-in/out; MOU provided (if facility not located in school); and safe transportation provided to/from center and home that meets needs of working families	Demonstrates detailed program safety plan (background checks on file/confidential); district/agency staffing requirements met; required parent sign-in/out; MOU provided (if facility not located in school); and safe transportation provided to/from center and home that meets needs of working families; <u>and</u> addresses use of IAN Safety Standards

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5**

Comments:

XI. BUDGET FORM/NARRATIVE, DETAILS & SUMMARY (Up to 5 POINTS)

0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points
Budget Form (Budget Narrative) not completed by applicant.	Some budget narrative pieces completed, but not all. *Examples*: (a) key anticipated costs not reflected in budget (e.g., evaluation and PD costs missing); OR (b) budget includes cost items not substantiated in proposal narratives; OR (c) excessive line items for equipment costs (without solid justification and intent to obtain IDOE pre-approval).	Budget narrative includes all anticipated line items (e.g., staffing, PD, evaluation, contracted services; transportation). Narratives adequately explain costs that are aligned to activities described in proposed RFP. Costs appear reasonable and permissible (and some items may require pre-approval by IDOE). Budget Summary is completed correctly and matches costs in Budget Form/Narrative.	Exemplary budget narrative clearly articulates all anticipated line items (e.g., staffing, PD, evaluation, contracted services; transportation). Narratives summarize costs that are clearly-aligned to activities in the proposed RFP. All costs appear reasonable and permissible. No errors on Budget Summary; costs match those in Budget Form/Narrative.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4**

Comments:
This program will begin in Year 2 (2019-20) and continue into Years 3 & 4.

Costs do not match those provided on the Budget Form (Attachment A). That is, on Attachment A, the application requests $300k / year x the three years they are requesting = $900k. On the required application Excel documents, however, the application requests $128k (year 1), $181K (year 2), $171k (year 3) and $163k (year 4).

Exemplary budget/detail preparation, aligned to elements described within the proposal. All costs appear reasonable and allocable.

FYI to IDOE: Contractual costs represent the largest funding category. The following cost discrepancies are noted between the MOUs and the applicant's Detailed Budget:

☐ MOU for Codelicious shows cost of $9K (see p 84). Budget (Contractual) shows $7,500.
☐ Attachment F includes "Storyworks – Scholastic subscriptions" at $2K. This is not reflected in budget.
☐ MOU for Snapology (anti-bulling) shows cost of $2,250 (see p 81). Not included in Budget.
☐ MOU for Youth Philanthropy shows cost of $500. Not in Budget.
☐ No MOU for "Camp Invention," STEM summer camp curriculum. Shown in Budget for $4K.
☐ No MOU for Bricks 4 Kids. Shown in Budget (Contractual) for $4K.

XII. GRANT PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION			(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points	**1-2 point range**	**3-4 point range**	**5 points**
Not organized in prescribed format. Program Narrative section far exceeded *30-page maximum* (i.e., 35 or more pages)	Grant materials are provided, but not in the sequence requested. *Abstract* exceeds 2 pages/*Program Narrative* section exceeds 35 pages; Did not double-space/use 12-point font.	Grant materials provided in sequence requested. *Abstract* and *Program Narratives* do not exceed maximum (2 pages/35 pages). Proposal double-space/12-pt font; and pages numbered with identifying headers on each page.	Exceptionally well organized with materials provided in sequence requested. *Abstract* and *Program Narratives* do not exceed maximum (2 pages/35 pages). Proposal double-space/12-pt font; and pages numbered with identifying headers on each page.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5**

Comments:

Name of Applicant: MSD of Pike Township

Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores	Points Possible	Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers
I. Project Abstract	5	4.3
II. Competitive Priority Points	10	10
III. Need for Project	5	4.3
IV. Partnerships/Collaboration	5	5
V. Program Design and Implementation	30	27.4
VI. Professional Development Plan	5	5
VII. Evaluation Plan	15	14.6
VIII. Support for Strategic Priorities	5	4.6
IX. Sustainability Plan	5	4.6
X. Safety and Transportation	5	5
XI. Budget Narrative	5	4
XII. Proposal Organization	5	5
TOTAL POINTS	**100** Total Points Possible	**93.8**